

## **Remarks**

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed March 27, 2008. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed March 27, 2008, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 18, 20, 22-25, 34-38, 40, 42-45, 54-58, 60, and 62-65 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 18, 20, 22, 24-25, 34-38, 40, 42, 44-45, 54-58, 60, 62, and 64-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereafter Park) in view of Beach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,713, hereafter Beach), Berger et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0093344 A1, hereafter Berger), and Rupert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915, hereafter Rupert). Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 were rejected as being unpatentable over Park, Berger, and Rupert, and in further view of Official Notice.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed March 27, 2008, Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 18, 20, 22, 24-25, 34-38, 40, 42, 44-45, 54-58, 60, 62, and 64-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereafter Park) in view of Beach et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,728,713, hereafter Beach), Berger et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0093344 A1, hereafter Berger), and Rupert et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915, hereafter Rupert). Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 were rejected as being unpatentable over Park, Berger, and Rupert, and in further view of Official Notice.

#### **Claim 1**

In the Office Action, it was submitted that Beach discloses *second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hierarchical namespace*. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Beach discloses a central database resident on a server that contains database objects (Abstract). A database object maintains a list of object IDs and an associated simple name for the object (column 6, lines 7-8). Directory objects may include other directory objects as part of the list, and there is a single distinguished object called the "root" directory (column 6, lines 8-11). The sequence of directory objects traversed starting at the root directory and continuing until the object of interest is found is called a "path" to the object, the path indicating a particular

location within the hierarchical namespace created among all directory objects present in the database (column 6, lines 11-16).

It appears from the above description that, in Beach, a hierarchical namespace is created amongst all of the directory objects in a single central database. However, Beach does not appear to disclose *second functions for incorporating combined content of the plurality of content repositories into a hierarchical namespace*.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 18, 34, and 54**

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 18, 34, and 54, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 2, 4-16, 20, 22-33, 35-38, 40, 42-53, 55-58, 60, and 62-65**

Claims 2, 4-16, 20, 22-33, 35-38, 40, 42-53, 55-58, 60, and 62-65 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

### **III. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including July 28, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 28, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/  
Guanyao Cheng  
Reg. No. 58,555

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Customer No. 23910